

10

SIXTEEN ANTIQUÆRIES

PROPOUNDED
To the Catechiser of DIO TREPHES.

The PREFACE.


If the Reader should be in a maze about the intent of these Antiquaries, he may please to take notice, that the Author conceived in the fittest way of answer to Mr. Prynns Sixteen Questions: Partly, because the chiefe of them are already propounded by the Honourable House of Commons to the Reverend Assembly for their resolution, whom to anticipate by his shallow indeavours, might be counted little better than a presumption. Partly, because divers of Mr. Prynns Quarries seem to be little better then captious, as requiring that to make a thing of Divine right, (namely, a cleare proof from Scripture in expresse termes) which no rationall man not ingaged will demand or expect. Now a captious Question cannot wel be answered better than by a Question; for which the Author wants not a good president, Mat. 21. 23. to the 27. Yet he hath not so bound himselfe up to Quarries, but in some matters of difference, hee takes liberty of dispute; especially about that great question of suspension from the Lords Supper; and that new Paradox of Mr. Prynns, that the Lords Supper is a converting Ordinance; which mistake arises from confounding those things that shoulde be distinguished; and attributing that to one Ordinance, which is the proper effect of another. For example, in the Lords Supper four Ordinances usually meet; namely, Prayer, Preaching, (at least in opening and applying the words of Institution) singing of Psalmes, and the administration of the Sacramentall elements.

Now wee deny not but Prayer and Preaching are converting ordinances: But the great question is, whether the aduall receiving of the Sacramentall elements be a converting Ordinance. This we deny, and unlesse Mr. Prynns can make this good, he speaks nothing to the purpose: but may as well prove Marriage, Ordination, or Buriall of the dead to be converting Ordinances, as the Lords Supper; since at all these the Prayers and Sermons that have been in use, no doubt have been effectuall means.

to convert divers; and in particular, Marriage teaches us admirable things about the love of Christ to his Church, &c. Yet I thinke never any was so mad, as to call any of these three converting Ordinances. The same reason is there of the Lords Supper. Therefore wee deny not but a scandalous person, yea, an heathen may be present at the Lords Supper, and hear the Prayers and exhortations, see the Elements consecrated, and all the Sacramentall actions, and this with a great deal of profit, if the Lord please to sanctifie all these unto him: which is further apparent in the other Sacrament of Baptisme, the present benefit whereof usually redounds more to the standers by, than to the party Baptized. But that the actuall receiving of the outward elements by a gracelesse scandalous person doth never convert him, I conceive may be clearly proved by this argument. He that eates and drinks damnation, that discernes not the Lords body, that murders Christ, certainly at that instant, and in that particular act is not converted: but so doth every unworthy receiver. Therefore a Father sayes well, that wicked men in the Lords Supper do receive panem Domini, but not panem Dominum; but certainly, at what instant a man is converted, he receives panem Dominum; nor can any possibly be converted, but at that instant he must of necessity receive Christ. If Mr. Prynne answer, he may be converted by Prayer preceeding, and the words of institution opened and applyed. I answer, 1. Then although he have the worthiness of person, yet he wants the worthiness of actuall preparation, and so is still unworthy in that respect at least. 2. Though upon the former supposition he be really worthy, (as having truth of grace) yet he is visibly unworthy, till he have given satisfaction to the Church for the particular scandall whereby he hath offended them, and dishonoured the name of God; and if he be truly humbled (as no doubt every true convert is) he will leave his gift at the Altar, and first go and be reconciled to his brother; and then come and offer his gift, Mat. 5. 23, 24. If he be not so fit to eat the Passover the first, God wil accept him in the second month. And for my part, I can apprehend no way like suspension, to prevent the double danger of an unworthy receiver; for if he neglect to come to the Lords Supper, he slightes it. If he come unworthily, he eates and drinks his own damnation or judgment. But being kept from the Sacrament, hee is preserved from both these guilts. And further, by this penalty may be brought to a through sight of his error, and so be fitted better for the Sacrament against the next opportunity. But enough, and too much by way of Preface. I fear I have made too great a Porch for so little an house. Yet I see not how it could well be spared, as being a necessary explication of my insuing design. I leave it to thy judgment, and both thee and it to Gods blessing.

R. D.

Sixteen Anti-queries;
Propounded to the Catechiser
Of
DIOTREPHESES.

I.  Hether no scandalous Sin belong to Ecclesiasticall cognizance: If so, why then did the Apostle, and Church of *Corinth* presume to judge the incestuous *Corinthian*, 1 *Cor.* 5. & 1 *Cor.* 2. Or why hath God given his Ministers the greatest abilities to judge of all sins, if they must onely see with other mens eyes, and judge nothing scandalous, but what the Magistrate judges so? If they may judge of any scandalous sin, why not of all? and that this is more then a judgement of dislike or reproof, see 1 *Cor.* 5. 12, 13. for so I may judge him that is without, who yet falls not under the sentence of excommunication, nor is capable of it.

II. Whether they who were the fittest and ablest judges of cases dubious and too hard for inferiour Magistrates, *Deut.* 17. 8, 9. (according to Mr. *Pryn*s own grant) might not lawfully judge of ordinary cases also? Surely, *Jeibro Exod.* 17. 17, 18. did not think *Moses* sinned simply in judging lesser matters, but counsell'd him rather for his owne & the peoples ease to refer petty matters to inferiour Judges. Further, if the High Priest might judge of civill matters, why not also, yea much more of spirituall, being more within his spheare as a spirituall person? Else the Magistrate, being a meer civill power might judge both of civil and spirituall cases; but the High Priest being a spirituall power, might judge onely of civill cases. We deny not the judging of scandalous sins to the Magistrate; and rest confident he wil never be so far catechised by Mr. *Pryn*n, as to deny the judging of scandals to the Ministry, &c.

III. Whether the cases of Leprosie and Jealousie were the onely cases wherein the Priests were appointed to be as Judges in the Old Testament; see the contrary, *Deut.* 17. 8, 9. which is also confest by Mr. *Pryn*n himself in his second question immediately foregoing.

IV. Whether any deny the Parliament and their Lay-Commissioners power to enquire after, and punish scandalous sinners, (though I finde not where they have any power by the Ordinance to punish) and whether that may not go very well hand in hand with the censures of the Church, and their enquiry. But the great question is, whether Lay-Commissioners have power from the Word to suspend Church censures against scandalous persons. If so, let Mr. *Pryn*n shew an expresse place of Scripture for such a suspension, and we shal soon yeeld the cause. Otherwise he must pardon us if we receive not this his Catechise for an Oracle.

V. Whether any Minister claime power *jure Divino* to examine witnesses upon oath: And whether Mr. *Pryn*n think the evidence against the incestuous

Corinthian was made good upon oath. If the Parliament out of their care to prevent mis-information, require an Oath of the Witnesses, I hope that doth not scruple his conscience: and if any Minister scruple it, the ruling Elders have *jus humanum*, and so by consequence *jus Divinum* to examine upon oath.

VI. Further, whether the not mentioning, or not appointing of ecclesiastical Jurisdiction in the Old Testament (if granted) be proove sufficient against the exercise of it in the New Testament: Yet if Mr. Prynn please to consult Ezk. 23. v. 28, 29. & Ezek. 44. 7, 9. I beleeve he will find that not onely ceremoni- all, but also morall pollutions defiled the house of God; and that therefore such were to be kept back.

VII. Whether Ministers under the Law had equal Jurisdiction with Ministers under the Gospel, and whether Magistrates either under the Law or Gospel had properly any Ecclesiasticall power. If the former, then Priests might excommunicate under the Law for scandalous sins, which both may be done, and hath been done under the Gospel, 1 Cor. 5. & Tit. 3. 10. If the latter, then let Mr. Prynn give us an expresse Scripture-evidence for the Magistrates power to excommunicate; or that the Church might not excommunicate (when once it had Christian Magistrates) till it had order from them.

VIII. Whether there be any expresse text in all the New Testament, giving Jurisdiction by Divine right to all Ministers, Presbyteries, &c. to suspend or excommunicate all scandalous persons; yea, though they professe and protest they will never repent. If so, let Mr. Prynn produce those places, and we shall make them good also against those that being convinced of scandalous sins, do externally pretend and profess repentance in general, but give not the Church offended particular satisfaction for a particular scandal. If he can produce no such positive text, then let him speak out, that a visible Devill, though he openly professe he will live and dye in his abominations, yet ought not to be denyed the Sacrament, if hee desire to have it: or else let him give us leave to prove our assertions by good consequences, which himselfe must be forced to use, for proving farre greater matters than Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction.

IX. What rules or presidents there are in Scripture to determine matters controverted between particular Churches, or in a particular church; and if the Officers of severall Churches may meet for that end, Act. 15. Why not also for relieving of parties wronged by any particular Church in way of censure, & otherwise, what relief could the Primitive Churches have had for 300 years after Christ. Who denies the last appeal to the Magistrate in case the Church either cannot, or will not doe their duty; or having done their duty, yet cannot prevail with obstinate Churches or persons to reclaim them?

X. Whether that power of censuring may justly be suspected, which of it self alone, is not fully able to redresse all abuses and corruptions: and whether then all power, both civill and ecclesiasticall may not be suspected; since the Magistrate cannot fully reform all abuses, and the Church power may reforme all abuses, or cut off all unreformable persons from their communion, which is all God requires of his Church. In which case, if the party

cen-

ensured obtrude himself forcibly upon the Church and Ordinances, the Church cannot be counted either irreligious or uncivill to repell such force with force, and therein to crave the Magistrates assistance, which hee cannot in conscience or equity deny. The Officers of the High Priest knew this well enough, and therefore were affraid to apprehend the Apostles forcibly, *Acts 5. 26.*

XI. Whether the Church, *Mat. 18. v. 15, 17.* being meant of Presbytery, (which Mr. *Pryn* seems to dislike) may not much more censure grosse sins committed against God, then lesser sins committed against my brother: and whether a truly pious soul be not more offended with grosse sins committed against God, than a particular wrong done unto himself. If it be meant of the Civill Magistrate, or Jewish Sanhedrin (as he pretends) there's no doubt but complaint might be made unto them of grosse sins as well as of personall wrongs. And although I cannot forgive the wrong done by a scandalous sinner to an whole society; yet if his repentance appear to me being a member of that society, I both may, and ought to forgive him for my owne particular: as when my brother wrongs me, I ought to forgive him the injury done my self, though I cannot forgive the wrong he doth God by the same offence.

XII. Whether they, who have right and power to determine controversies authoritatively, have not also right to censure and suppress scandals: Otherwise those Seducers might stil have gone on to trouble the Church of *Antioch*, notwithstanding the decrees of the Synod, had there been no power in the Church to suppress them: And if the Church had power then to judge Heresies and scandalls, let Mr. *Pryn* shew where they lost that Charter; and where *Christ* said the Church should have that power no longer then till he sent them Christian Magistrates; or that civill censures give a *superseas*, to Ecclesiasticall censures.

XIII. Whether that precept of the Apostle, *1 Cor. 5.* for casting out the incestuous *Corinthian*, be not a cleare & constant president for the like censure to be past upon all scandalous sinners. Otherwise let Mr. *Pryn* give us a reason why one scandalous sin should be censured by the Church, rather then another. He that bid them purge out the old leaven, and not to eat with a scandalous brother, I think speaks plaine enough, that such a person ought to be cast out. Doth not the Scripture by instancing in one particular, include all of the same kind; and must not every text be interpreted in the largest sense, unlesse there be some just ground of limitation? I thought it had been a good rule both in Logick and Divinity, *A quatenus ad omne valet consequentia*. Otherwise if his blaming them for not casting out the incestuous *Corinthian* be not a just item for the Church to cast out all scandalous persons then his blaming them for not mourning for that scandalous sin, is no warning for any Church to mourne for scandalous sins committed by any of their members, *1 Cor. 5. 2.* I cannot see why the censure of a Magistrate should hinder Church-censures, more than the reproof of a Magistrate should hinder Church-reproof and admonition. The same offence committed both against Church and State, may justly be reprov'd & censured both by Church and State. As for Suspension, which he so much stickles against both in this

(6)

and other places; let him shew me a reason why they who have power to do the greater, may not doe the lesser. He that hath power to hang, I think hath also power to mulct or scourge; and why should not they have power to suspend from one Ordinance, that have power to cast out of the Church, and so to keep back from all Ordinances? (according to Mr. *Prynne*.) Though for my part I see not where he can cleare it by Scripture that an excommunicated person must be kept from all Ordinances. To instance particularly in hearing, where is it said an excommunicated person shall not have so much as the priviledge of one that is without, 1 *Cor.* 14. 24, 25. Might an Infidell heare the Word for his conversion, and shall an excommunicated person be denyed the benefit of that Ordinance? I grant by excommunication he is as an heathen, but why he may not have the priviledge of one that is without, I desire Mr. *Prynne* to instruct me, and I shall thanke him for it. For my part, I beleve this opinion of his is as true as that other formerly vented by him with so much confidence, namely, that the Lords Supper is a converting ordinance. But I pray, where is there any cleare Scripture evidence, either by way of precept or example, that the Lords Supper was appointed to convert, or hath converted any. We deny not but the meditation of *Christs* death, the words of institution, and the Sacramentall elements and actions may doe much, and let Mr. *Prynne* shew mee in Scripture, why either an excommunicated person, or an infidell may not be present at all these, yet neither of them may be admitted to partake of the Ordinance, and who knows what a prevailing argument it may be for their conversion to see the children of God sitting at his Table, and themselves shut out as dogs, *Luke* 13. 28 That which shall worke confusion at the day of judgement may now worke conversion in the day of grace: yet I dare not say, every thing that may convert, is a converting ordinance; the works of God, an holy conversation, and the sufferings of the martyrs may possibly convert, and no doubt have converted many: yet whoever called them converting ordinances? They well may be occasions of converting, but it must be an expresse word of Institution that makes a converting Ordinance; or at least to make a thing properly a Divine Ordinance, there must bee a strong and cleare consequence from Scripture. And here by the way I humbly conceive that *jus Divinum* is of a larger extent, than either a Divine Ordinance, or a Divine institution: There is no lawfull or good action, but hath a *jus Divinum* to justifie it; and that either *mandatum*, or *permisivum*, either in expresse termes, or by good (though not immediate) consequence; but this is not enough to make a Divine Ordinance. This I note the rather to take away that cavill against divers things in the Presbyterian government, as pleaded for *jure Divino*: the meaning is not, that every particular in that Government hath expresse words of Scripture immediately to make it good: nor can any Church-government in the world, plead by such a Charter: but that what is held in it as of Divine right may be cleared by good consequence out of Scripture, and hath no just Scripture evidence against it. But I crave pardon for this long digression. Onely I desire the Reader to observe how importunate Mr. *Prynne* is for us to bring expresse proofs of Scripture for our tenets; and yet neither

hath,

hath, nor can bring one expresse place to prove the Lords Supper a converting ordinance; but is glad to fly to consequences, and those both weak and erroneous.

XIV. Whether, the Magistrate punishing of an obstinate offender (at the motion of the Church, make him a meer servant or executioner to Presbyteries, Congregations, or Church-officers. If one particular Minister may in the name of God, command a Magistrate to do his duty, whether it be in matters of Religion or Justice; I see not why a company of Ministers, &c. may not desire him to punish a malefactor, which he ought to doe, whether desired by them or no. It seems by Mr. *Prynns* inference the State of *Scotland* is a meer Servant and executioner to the Church; and the Presbyterian Government is like to prove as bad as that of the Pope & Prelates: such odious comparisons might with far more honor and conscience be buried in silence.

XV. Whether may I not desire Authority to settle that *jure Divino*, which indeed is so (although not so apprehended by divers in Authority) and which both Parliament and people have covenanted the settling of, according to the word of God. And whether most of the Reformed Churches have not this (unlimited, arbitrary) power, as (he calls it) to censure all scandalous sinners, and that without any enumeration of particular sins, or appeal to Lay-commissioners: and so (according to M. *Prynns*) are in a worse case then if they were under the domineering of the Lordly Prelates.

XVI. Whether the former abuse of the Magistrates favour, with all the evil consequences thereof, be a safe ground to deny that just power where-withall God hath invested his Church, and of the exercise whereof wee have examples in the new Testament. And whether by the same argument Magistracy it selfe might not be cryed downe, since there is no form of Government, whether inferiour or superiour, but hath been too too much abused to tyranny, &c. Yet I wonder withall Mr. *Prynns* doth not bring one instance of tyranny under the Presbyterian Government in any of the Reformed Churches: who I hope do not deserve the name of *Discepoli*, nor need to be catechised by Mr. *Prynns*.

To conclude therefore with him, I grant Christs yoke is easie, but not to a carnall heart. And I desire Mr. *Prynns* to give one instance in practice, where the Presbyterian Government, hath been an hard yoke, unlesse to such who stickle for a lawlesse liberty of doing and speaking what they please under the notion of a pretended liberty of conscience.

If I should make bold to adde one Question more to the sixteen; namely, whether by what Mr. *Prynns* hath written about this and other subjects, it doth not appeare that he is far better versed in Law than Gospel: it might happily bee offensive; and therefore I forbear: onely I shall add this, that if the Gospel prevailed more, the Law would be in far lesse request: and with heartily the fear of this did not make too many stickle so much against the Presbyterian Government, which if once rightly settled, I dare venture to prophecy it would cut off many needlesse Law-suits, & prevent many a bitter potion. I honour both Law and Physick; yet wish with all my heart that every man were so conscientious and peaceable as there might be no need of Law.

Lawyers: and so temperate and healthfull, as there might bee no worke for Physicians. And he that is of another mind, I shall bee bold to tell him he is in the number of those that eat up the sin of Gods people, and set their hearts upon their iniquity, *Hos. 4. 8.* How ever, I cannot but wonder at Mr. Prynn overweening confidence both in this and other writings of his about church Government. He cannot but know that the Honourable Houses of Parliament after consultation had with the Assembly of Divines, and a solemne Covenant entred into to reform the Government according to the Word, have past an Ordinance for suspension of scandalous persons from the Sacrament. And therefore it might well have become him not to write so magnificiently, as if the spirit of God had left all them to come to him. Had any, being not a profess Lawyer, past as confident a vote against any Law matter determined by an Assembly of the ablest Judges and Lawyers, I should not have blamed Mr. Prynn, if he had said, *Ne jutor ultra crepidam.* Let him selfe then judge whether it bee not a presumption for one that is not a Divine to vote so peremptorily against an Assembly of the most able and godly Divines in the Christian world. Hath Mr. Prynn been present at all the debates about this argument, and heard all that was argued for it in the Reverend Assembly? He might at least have suspended his Catechise, till he had seen what answer they could have given to the Queries of the Honourable House of Commons, but since he is so confident in particular against suspension: Let him answer me directly, whether none are to be suspended from the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. If he say some may be suspended, let him shew me an expresse place of Scripture to warrant it, and what persons may bee suspended, and in what cases. If he hold the universall negative, then it will necessarily follow that Infants, fools, mad-men, persons actually drunk, yea, very heathens and infidells ought to be admitted to the Lords Supper. If he say, all these are visibly incapable of that Ordinance: I ask him why? for the Scripture sayes not in expresse termes, admit no infidell, mad-man, &c. The ground then of their non-admittance must be cleared by way of consequence, because such cannot receive worthily. Its apparent then, that visible unworthines is a just ground of non-admission to the Lords Supper. As therefore reall unworthinesse should make the party forbear, so visible unworthinesse is a just ground for the Church to suspend him: and that whether this unworthines be personall or preparatory, and this latter bee negative by naturall incapacity, or privative by neglect, or positive by the guilt of some scandalous sin unrepented of; any of these, if known, make a person visibly unworthy. If then visible unworthinesse be the *causa formalis*, of non-admission; then a *quatenus ad omne*, &c. all that are visibly unworthy must be suspended. Nor can Mr. Prynn prove it by Scripture or good Logick that a generall outward shew of repentance, can make him visibly worthy, who by a scandalous sin hath made himself visibly unworthy; nay, did he truly repent, unless that repentance were visible, (as the scandall was) I should question his admission. He that is really worthy, may be visibly unworthy; as he that is really unworthy, may be visibly worthy.